



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/838,807 | 04/20/2001 | Michael T. Brown | 10011540-1 | 3525 |

7590 10/11/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KLIMACH, PAULA W

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2135

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/838,807 | Applicant(s) BROWN, MICHAEL T. | |
| | Examiner Paula W. Klimach | Art Unit 2135 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,16,18 and 22-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,16,18 and 22-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on 7/17/06. The amendment filed on 7/17/06 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently pending claims are 1, 4-7, 9-11, 16, 18, and 22-39.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/06 have been fully considered. However, due to the Applicant's amendment, new grounds of rejection have been provided. Below is the new rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 16, 18, 22-28, 31-32, and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland et al (5,848,412) in view of Hind et al. (6,941,459 B1) in view of the book by Stallings ("Network and Internetwork Security").

In reference to claims 1, 16, 31, and 35, Rowland discloses a method for sharing user information, comprising (abstract): receiving from a user an identification of a level of access that is to be extended to a web site host (column 5 lines 14-23); assigning a user code to the web

Art Unit: 2135

site host when the user visits a web site maintained by the web site host (Fig. 6); receiving from the web site host a request for information concerning the user and the name of the server (column 6 lines 24-32); determining a level of access for which the web site host is authorized from the user code received from the web site host (column 6 lines 50-54); and transmitting user information to the web site host that pertains to the user code (part 712 Fig. 7).

Rowland does not expressly disclose sending the assigned user code from the network service to the user computer to enable the user to provide the user code.

Hind discloses receiving with a network service an identification of a level of access to user information that is to be extended to a web site host, the identification being received from a user computer via a network (Fig. 9B); assigning with the network a user code that is pertinent to the identified level of access (column 28 lines 45-55); sending the assigned user code from the network service to the user computer via a network to enable the user to provide the user code to the web site host when the user visits a web site maintained by the web site host (column 28 lines 24-44); and transmitting from the network service to the web site host via a network user information that pertains to the user code (column 27 lines 24-29).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to selectively encrypt the service as disclosed by Hind in the system of Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would enable the service to be controlled for multiple users (Hind Abstract).

Although Rowland discloses a process to determine the level of access available to the web site, Rowland does not disclose a system wherein the browser receives an access code to

Art Unit: 2135

determine the level of access. Rowland also teaches receiving from the website host a request for information concerning the user.

Stallings discloses a system wherein the Initiator A provides Responder B, which corresponds to the website host, with the nonce N1 (user code) when the user visits Responder B. Stallings teaches further receiving from the Responder B the nonce N1, user code that was received from the web site host (pages 135-136 Figure 4.16).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the user access code in the form of a Nonce and to then receive the Nonce N1 from the Responder, web site host, for determining the level of access in Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because sending the receiving the user code that was provided earlier ensures that the correct code is at the receiver and the sender, further the nonce can be used to uniquely identify the transaction.

In reference to claims 27 and 31, Rowland discloses a method for sharing user information, comprising (abstract): assigning with the e-service a user code to each level of access and therefore each information set (711 Fig. 7 and column 6 lines 11-18); receiving at the e-service from the user an indication of a level of access that is to be granted to all web sites visited by the user (712 Fig. 7); determining with the e-service a level of access for which the web site host is authorized from the user code received from the web site host (column 6 lines 50-54); and transmitting from the e-service to the web site host user information that pertains to the user code received from the web site host (column 6 lines 64-67). An e-service is any asset that is made available via the Internet to drive new revenue streams or create new efficiencies.

In the system of Rowland the website receives user information and therefore an e-service since the user information is an asset that is made available via the Internet to create new efficiencies.

Rowland does not expressly disclose sending to the user computer from the e-service a network a user code associated with the selected level of access.

Hind discloses receiving from the user computer with the e-service via a network selection of a level of access (column 28 lines 45-44); sending to the user computer from the e-service via a network a user code associated with the selected level of access (column 28 lines 24-44); receiving from a web site host the e-service (column 27 lines 24-29).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to selectively encrypt the service as disclosed by Hind in the system of Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would enable the service to be controlled for multiple users (Hind Abstract).

Although Rowland discloses the use of access level (user code) for the e-service, Rowland does not teach receiving at the e-service a user code that has been provided to a web site host by the user.

Stallings discloses a system wherein the Initiator A provides Responder B, which corresponds to the website host, with the nonce N1 (user code) when the user visits Responder B (pages 135-136 Figure 4.16).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the user access code in the form of a Nonce and to then receive the Nonce N1 from the Responder, web site host, for determining the level of access in Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because sending the

receiving the user code that was provided earlier ensures that the correct code is at the receiver and the sender, further the nonce can be used to uniquely identify the transaction.

In reference to claims 5, 18, and 36, wherein the step of determining the level of access comprises comparing the user code provided by the web site host with a user code assigned to the user and relevant to a particular user information set (column 5 lines 55-58).

In reference to claims 7 and 38 wherein the step of transmitting user information comprises transmitting user profile information while withholding personal information about the user (Fig. 6).

In reference to claims 22 and 39, wherein receiving an identification of a level of access comprises receiving selection of one of an anonymous mode in which only profile information and no personal information is provided, and a full disclosure mode in which profile information and personal information is provided (column 5 line 66 to column 6 line 7).

In reference to claim 23 wherein receiving an identification of a level of access further comprises receiving user selection of a category of information to share (Fig. 5).

In reference to claim 24, wherein receiving user selection of a category comprises receiving user selection of at least one of a personal category a business category, and a financial category.

In reference to claims 25 and 37, wherein assigning a user code comprises assigning a first code pertinent to an initial level of access to be provided to the web site host and a second code pertinent to a deeper level of access that can be manually provided by the user if desired.

Although Rowland discloses assigning codes to websites that are possibly assigned manually, Rowland does not disclose assigning the second code pertinent to a deeper level of

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add more levels of code pertinent to deeper levels of access in the system Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow greater control on the amount of access.

In reference to claims 26, 28, and 32, wherein providing the user code comprises automatically providing the first user code to the web site host when the user visits the web site, and providing the second user code to the web site host if the user chooses to so provide the second user code.

Although Rowland discloses assigning codes to websites that are possibly assigned manually or automatically, Rowland does not disclose assigning he second code pertinent to a deeper level of.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add more levels of code pertinent to deeper levels of access in the system Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow greater control on the amount of access.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland in view of Hind and further in view of Stallings as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schneier.

In reference to the user code comprises a transient key. A transient key is a key that expires after a period of time.

Rowland does not expressly disclose the code that was designated by the user comprising a transient key.

Schneier teaches that a key should expire automatically; therefore a system should have a policy that determines the permitted lifetime of a key (pages 183-184).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a code that expires after a certain period of time as disclosed in Schneier in the system of Rowland. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the longer the code is used the greater the chance that the system will be compromised.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland in view of Stallings as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Henrick et al (6,055,510).

Regarding transmitting user information from a centralized repository which stores user information for a plurality of users.

Rowland does not expressly disclose transmitting the user information from a centralized repository that stores user information from a plurality of users.

Henrick discloses a system and method of storing user information in a centralized repository (column 4 lines 32-37) and transmitting the user information from this centralized repository to a website (particular advertiser; column 4 line 66 to column 5 line 10)

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a central repository to store the user information and transmit the user information to the host website. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the ISP can take advantage of the unique customer knowledge with respect to user

likes and dislikes, while preserving the privacy of the customer, to attract businesses with interest in customer bases.

Claims 29-30, and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowland in view of Hind and further in view of Stallings as in claims 1, 16, 27, and 31 and further in view of Davis et al (6,367,009 B1)

In reference to claim 30, and 34, Rowland discloses a method for acquiring user information that is used to personalize a web site for the user (column 1 lines 1-30 in combination with abstract).

Although Rowland discloses the website host requesting user information (column 6 lines 12-15), Rowland does not disclose the user information being stored at centralized repository and providing the user code to the centralized repository.

Davis discloses the ETS that is a relational database manager (centralized repository storing) that stores user information needed by the intermediate MTS (website server; column 9 lines 24-48). The client delegates authentication to the MTS to retrieve the user information. The MTS uses the certificate chain, which includes information from the client certificate that was provided by the client (column 13 lines 1-58), this performs the function of providing authentication and code required by the ETS (column 14 lines 14-40) to authenticate the MTS and provide the user information (column 9 lines 25-48 in combination with column 13 lines 53-58). This is the function of the user code sent to the website host.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a central repository to store the user information and transmit the user

Art Unit: 2135

information to the host website. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the ISP can take advantage of the unique customer knowledge with respect to user likes and dislikes, while preserving the privacy of the customer, to attract businesses with interest in customer bases.

In reference to claim 29, and 33, wherein the user code is automatically appended to a uniform resource locator (URL) of the web site.

Rowland and Davis do not expressly disclose the code being appended to the URL of the web site.

However, since Davis discloses sending the certificate as part of a message and Rowland discloses sending the request with the information that the web server requires, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to append the code to the URL. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would conserve bandwidth to send it as one message instead of multiple messages.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2135


will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paula W. Klimach whose telephone number is (571) 272-3854. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thr 9:30 a.m to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PWK
Monday, October 02, 2006


HOSUK SONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER